Whole-body MRI compared with standard pathways for staging metastatic disease in lung and colorectal cancer: the Streamline diagnostic accuracy studies

Stuart A Taylor,¹* Susan Mallett,² Anne Miles,³ Stephen Morris,⁴ Laura Quinn,² Caroline S Clarke,⁵ Sandy Beare,⁶ John Bridgewater,⁷ Vicky Goh,⁸ Sam Janes,⁹ Dow-Mu Koh,¹⁰ Alison Morton,¹¹ Neal Navani,⁹ Alfred Oliver,¹¹ Anwar Padhani,¹² Shonit Punwani,¹ Andrea Rockall¹³ and Steve Halligan¹ on behalf of the Streamline investigators

¹Centre for Medical Imaging, University College London, London, UK ²Institute of Applied Health Research, NIHR Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

- ³Department of Psychological Sciences, Birkbeck, University of London, London, UK ⁴Applied Health Research, University College London, London, UK
- ⁵Research Department of Primary Care and Population Health, and Priment Clinical Trials Unit, University College London, London, UK
- ⁶Cancer Research UK & UCL Cancer Trials Centre, University College London, London, UK
- ⁷UCL Cancer Institute, University College London, London, UK
- ⁸Department of Cancer Imaging, School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences, King's College London, London, UK
- ⁹Lungs for Living Research Centre, UCL Respiratory, University College London, London, UK
- ¹⁰Department of Radiology, The Royal Marsden Hospital, Sutton, UK
- ¹¹c/o Centre for Medical Imaging, University College London, London, UK
- ¹²Mount Vernon Centre for Cancer Treatment, Mount Vernon Hospital, Northwood, UK
- ¹³Imaging Department, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, UK

*Corresponding author stuart.taylor@ucl.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Stuart A Taylor reports personal fees from Robarts Clinical Trials Inc. (London, ON, Canada) outside the submitted work. Andrea Rockall reports personal fees from Guerbet (Paris, France) outside the submitted work. Vicky Goh and Anwar Padhani report grants from Siemens AG (Erlangen, Germany) outside the submitted work. Steve Halligan reports non-financial support from iCad Inc. (Nashua, NH, USA) outside the submitted work and was a member of the Health Technology Assessment (HTA) commissioning board (2008–14). Stephen Morris declares past membership of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) HTA Clinical Evaluation and Trials Board (2007–9), HTA Commissioning Board (2009–13), Public Health Research Board (2011–17), Health Services and Delivery Research (HSDR) Commissioning Board (2014–16) and HSDR Board (2014–18), and current membership of the NIHR Programme Grants for Applied Research expert subpanel (2015–present) and HSDR Evidence Synthesis Sub Board (2016–present).

Disclaimer: This report contains transcripts of interviews conducted in the course of the research and contains language that may offend some readers.

Published December 2019 DOI: 10.3310/hta23660

Plain English summary

The Streamline diagnostic accuracy studies

Health Technology Assessment 2019; Vol. 23: No. 66 DOI: 10.3310/hta23660

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain English summary

olorectal and lung cancer are the leading causes of cancer-related deaths in the UK. Optimal treatment depends on accurately defining (or 'staging') the extent of disease, particularly if it has spread to other parts of the body such as the liver. Current staging pathways are complex and rely on a variety of tests that use X-rays, such as computed tomography and positron emission tomography–computed tomography scans. Patients often undergo multiple tests before starting treatment. Alternatively, it is possible to scan the whole body using magnetic resonance imaging without X-rays, and this may be more accurate and reduce the time and number of tests needed before treatment can start. We compared the ability to detect cancer spread, efficiency, patient experience and cost-effectiveness of staging based on whole-body magnetic resonance imaging with the standard NHS pathways in participants newly diagnosed with either lung (187 participants) or colorectal (299 participants) cancer. We found that the whole-body magnetic resonance imaging pathway was as accurate as standard staging pathways and resulted in very similar treatment decisions made by the clinical teams. The whole-body magnetic resonance imaging pathway detected 67% and 50% of participants with cancer spread in colorectal and lung cancer, respectively, compared with 63% and 54%, respectively, for standard staging. However, staging was quicker using whole-body magnetic resonance imaging (by 5 days for colorectal cancer and 6 days for lung cancer) and needed on average one less test to stage colorectal cancer. The whole-body magnetic resonance imaging pathway was also cheaper (costing on average £216 and £317 for colorectal and lung cancer, respectively, compared with £285 and £620, respectively, for standard pathways). Participants generally found whole-body magnetic resonance imaging more burdensome than standard imaging but most preferred the whole-body magnetic resonance imaging pathway if it reduced the time to staging and/or the number of tests. Agreement between different radiology doctors interpreting the same whole-body magnetic resonance imaging scan was moderate for colon cancer and low for lung cancer, emphasising the need for training.

[©] Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2019. This work was produced by Taylor et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.819

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the Clarivate Analytics Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 10/68/01. The contractual start date was in October 2012. The draft report began editorial review in December 2018 and was accepted for publication in May 2019. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2019. This work was produced by Taylor *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor John Powell Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Senior Clinical Researcher, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Director, NIHR Dissemination Centre, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk